

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated April 17, 2008, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1 and 2 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1 and 2 are amended for clarification purposes. Reconsideration of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Tran during the telephone interview held June 10, 2008, are gratefully appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 1 and 2 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration on the part of the Examiner as the Amendment merely clarifies the claimed features of the invention; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to objections raised in the Final Rejection. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for including subject matter not included in the written description. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the Interview with Examiner Tran, the amendments to the claims, as suggested by the Examiner, overcome the rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because there is no source for a “reproduced signal.” The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the Interview with Examiner Tran, the amendments to the claims, as suggested by the Examiner, overcome the rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 100341-00046.**

Respectfully submitted,



---

Tarik M. Nabi  
Registration Number 55,478

Customer Number 004372  
ARENT FOX LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
Telephone: 202-857-6000  
Fax: 202-638-4810

TMN